DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 156 FL 014 961

AUTHOR Jun-Aust, Heesoon
TITLE Individual Differences in Second Language Learning of Korean Immigrant Students.
PUB DATE 29 Mar 85
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the International Conference on Second/Foreign Language Acquisition by Children (Oklahoma City, OK, March 29, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Children; Elementary Education; *Immigrants; Individual Differences; *Korean Americans; *Learning Motivation; Listening Comprehension; *Peer Relationship; *Second Language Learning; Speech Skills

ABSTRACT

A study of the effects of peer-pairing and integrative motivation on both formal language performance and actual language behavior with Korean immigrant children is presented. The formal language learning was measured by tests of oral production and listening comprehension, and actual language behavior was measured by observations in a natural school environment. Both oral production and listening comprehension posttests were administered four-and-a-half months after pretest administration. Thirty elementary school children (11 boys and 19 girls) were randomly assigned to two groups, resulting in 14 children (8 girls and 6 boys) in the peer-paired group and 16 (11 girls and 5 boys) in the no-paired group. Stepwise multiple regression analyses indicated that (1) peer-pairing was a significant predictor for listening comprehension and the actual language behavior, and (2) prior language knowledge was the best predictor of formal language learning. The theoretical implications are that peer-pairing not only facilitates formal listening comprehension and actual language behavior, but also enhances social relationships between second-language learners and the target-language speakers. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED256156

Individual Differences in Second Language Learning of Korean Immigrant Children

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Heesoon Jun-Aust

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Heesoon Jun-Aust, Ph.D.

Centralia College

Centralia, WA 98531

FL014961

Abstract

Individual Differences in Second Language learning
of Korean Immigrant Children

By Heesoon Jun-Aust
Centralia College

The purpose of the study was to investigate the effects of peer-pairing and integrative motivation, on both formal language performance and actual language behavior with Korean immigrant children. The formal language learning was measured by tests of oral production and listening comprehension and the actual language behavior was measured by observations of actual language behavior in a natural school environment. Both oral production and listening comprehension posttests were administered four and one-half months after the administration of the pretests. Thirty elementary school children (11 boys and 19 girls) were randomly assigned to one of the two groups, resulting in 14 children (8 girls and 6 boys) in the peer-paired group and 16 children (11 girls and 5 boys) in the non-paired group. Stepwise multiple regression analyses indicated that (a) peer-pairing was a significant predictor for listening comprehension and the actual language behavior, and (b) prior language knowledge was the best predictor of formal language learning. The theoretical implications of the study are that peer-pairing not only facilitates both formal listening comprehension and the actual language behavior, but also enhances social relationships between second-language learners and the target language speaker.

Individual Differences in Second Language
Learning of Korean Immigrant Children

Second language learning has undergone five major phases since 1900. The "direct" method was applied as a medium of instruction from approximately 1900 to 1925. The underlying assumption was that direct exposure to the target language was the only efficient way to learn a second language. The "grammar translation" method and "audiolingual" method were followed. These three methods assumed that individuals were affected identically by a particular medium of instruction. Gardner and Lambert (1959) were pioneers who examined the influence of learner variables on second language learning. Attitudinal, motivational, intellectual variables, and the effects of their interaction were popular topics studied by many researchers during this phase (Ainsfeld & Lambert, 1961; Brown, 1973; Chastain, 1975; Christiansen & Livermore, 1970; Gardner, 1972, 1980; Gardner, Ginsberg, & Smythe, 1976; Gardner & Lambert, 1965, 1972; Gardner & Smythe, 1975; Hamayan, Genesee, & Tucker, 1977; Hickey, 1972; Kittell, 1963; Lambert, Gardner, Barik, & Tunstall, 1963; Lambert, Tucker, & d'Anglejan; 1973).

Sociolinguistic aspects of second-language learning were popular topics of study in the fifth phase (Ervin-Tripp, 1964; Fishman, 1967, 1968; Fishman, Cooper & Ma, 1968; Gumperz, 1967; Holmes, 1978; Hymes, 1967; Lambert, 1963, 1967; Oller, Beca, & Virgil, 1977; Oller, Hudson, & Liu, 1977; Schumann, 1976, 1978; Tucker, Hamayan, & Genesee, 1976; Zampogna, 1976).

The results of second-language learning research seem to be contradictory--partly because of vaguely defined variables, poor methodology, poor assessment tools, and poor understanding of the particular second language group's cultural and language idiosyncracies (Alderson, 1979; Chastain, 1979;

Dieterich, Freeman, & Crandall, 1979; Lado, 1961; Robinett, 1978; Roca, 1955). Better controlled studies (Fillmore, 1976; Genesee and Hamayan, 1980) which investigated individual differences in second-language learning revealed that intelligence and desire to be accepted by the English-speaking peers were major determinants for the second-language learning.

Although Fillmore's (1976) study revealed that peer interaction in social situations and the desire of children to be accepted by American children were important variables to facilitate second-language learning, an important concern not addressed was whether the peer-pairing effect would be the same in a normal classroom situation. Her five subjects played with their paired peers in a room containing many attractive toys, and it was not clear whether the toys were instrumental to peer interaction or if having peers present was adequate for peer interaction. If the toys were instrumental, then classroom implementation of peer-pairing would have little value. In addition, Fillmore used a correlational technique to examine the effects of peer-pairing and the present study used an experimental design to investigate the effects of peer-pairing on second-language learning.

Another consideration was to compare the effects of motivation and the effects of peer-pairing on children's second language learning. This study was unique in that it attempted to define integrative motivation by multiple measures from both the learner and the learner's teacher. Four measures of integrative motivation--two from the subjects and two from the subjects' teachers--were used. Furthermore, in an attempt to obtain a valid measure of integrative motivation, one of the measures from each subject and each teacher was a standardized scale. The reviewed literature (Carroll, 1977; Chastain, 1975; Crone & Marlowe, 1964; Fillmore, 1976; Hamayan, Genesee, & Tucker, 1977; Rubin, 1975; Schumann, 1978; Stern, 1975; Swain & Burnaby, 1976) claimed that

motivation and personality characteristics enhance or retard second-language learning. Detailed review concerning motivation and personality characteristics indicated that there was an overlap between the two definitions. For example, individuals with outgoing, extroverted or uninhibited personalities also showed strong motivation to be liked by members of the target language group and would try to make friends with them (Fillmore, 1976; Rubin, 1975). Therefore, both personality characteristics--such as "popularity," "outgoingness," "not shy," and "uninhibition" and motivational characteristics--such as "desire to be accepted by others," "desire to be like the speakers of second language," and "desire to learn the second language" were included in the definition of integrative motivation.

Of equal concern in this study was construction of appropriate language tests for the subjects. A substantial number of studies that were reviewed used test items that are inappropriate to a particular ethnic group or societal setting. For instance, the variables that were found to be significant in Canadian research were , without evidence, assumed by some researchers (Oller, Beca, & Virgil, 1977; Oller, Hudson, & Liu, 1977; Schumann, 1975; Spolsky, 1969) to be significant in the United States. Likewise, the variables that were found to be significant with one ethnic group were also assumed to be significant for all ethnic groups (Pierson et al 1980). The present study avoided the above limitations by constructing test items around the tradition and the culture of the subjects.

The purpose of the present study is to examine factors influencing individual differences in second language learning. The effects investigated were (a) peer-pairing with American children of second language learner's choice, and (b) integrative motivation.

Three hypotheses of the study were (a) subjects who are peer-paired will have significantly high scores on both formal language performance and the actual language behavior than subjects who are not peer-paired, (b) subjects who score high on integrative motivation will have significantly higher scores on both formal language performance and the actual language behavior than students who score low on integrative motivation, and (c) subjects who are peer-paired and score high on integrative motivation will have significantly higher scores on both formal language performance and the actual language behavior than students who either are peer-paired with lower scores on integrative motivation, or are not peer-paired with higher scores on integrative motivation.

Method

Subjects

Limited-English-speaking Korean children in two elementary schools in the Tacoma Public School District in Tacoma, Washington were selected as subjects. The two elementary schools were about seven blocks apart and both schools had a "pullout" bilingual program conducted by English-speaking Korean teachers. Children were placed in the bilingual program on the basis of their performanced on the Tacoma Public School District's language proficiency test (Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, Dunn, 1959). These children's English proficiency were reassessed by their bilingual teachers at the beginning of the study. Only those children who were identified as limited English speakers by both assessments were included in the study. The children's performance level was 20% or lower than 20% in order to qualify the limited English speakers. All the subjects were recent (less than six months) immigrants whose ~~target~~ language at home was Korean. In other words, they had similar cultural and linguistic environments, even though their age range was wide (grade 1 to 6). These children came from 19 different classes (9 from one school and 24 from another school).

To divide the children into a control group and an experimental group, the classes were randomly assigned to one of the treatment conditions. This resulted in an unequal sample size between the control and the experimental groups (15 in the control group and 18 in the experimental group). Random assignment of subjects was not used in order to avoid placing children from the same class into the control and the experimental groups. Due to attrition when the children's families relocated, only data pertaining to 14 children from the control group and 16 children from the experimental group were analyzed (see table 1).

Table 1

Number of Subjects by Grade, Sex, and Treatment Conditions

	Boys		Girls	
Grade	Peer Pair	Non Peer Pair	Peer Pair	Non Peer Pair
1	0	1	1	1
2	0	0	0	0
3	1	0	3	1
4	1	1	2	0
5	4	0	2	6
6	0	3	0	3
Total	6	5	8	11

Predictor Variables

There were two predictor variables; peer-pairing and subject's integrative motivation. Peer-pairing versus non-peer-pairing was experimentally manipulated on a longitudinal basis (4 1/2 months) and the integrative motivation was examined correlationally.

1. Peer-pairing versus non-peer-pairing. Peer-pairing was determined by random assignment of the classes to one of the treatment conditions. The Korean children in the peer-pairing condition were asked to name an English-speaking child from their classes with whom they would like to work. The chosen peers were seated with the subjects by their classroom teachers. In

addition, the teachers asked the American peers to "help" their Korean friends "to learn English by explaining to them, answering their questions, or by just being friends." The teachers were informed that the crucial variable of the study was the effect of peer-pairing on English language learning. In the non-peer-pairing condition, there were no special seating arrangements.

2. Subjects' integrative motivation. The integrative motivation of the subjects was determined by the child's report and the teacher's rating. Two sets of attitude measures were administered to each subject and each subject's teacher. One was a structured interview with a questionnaire format, and the other was a standardized scale (The Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale for the children; (Piers & Harris, 1969) and The Devereux Elementary School Behavior Rating Scale for the teachers; (Spivack & Swift, 1967).

The test-retest reliability for the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale was .77 and construct validity was reported in the test manual (Cox, 1966; Gorlow, Butler, & Guthrie, 1963; Piers & Harris, 1964). Only those items pertaining to cluster scores of popularity were used as a partial measure of integrative motivation since the literature indicated that desire to be liked by others is the best measure of integrative motivation. Reported test-retest reliability ranges for the Devereux Elementary School Behavior Rating Scale were .72 to .82 according to the test manual. Only those items pertaining to integrative motivation were analyzed.

Items for questionnaires (see Appendices A & B) were based on the literature reviewed, which suggested variables that appeared to have significant effects on second language learning (Carroll, 1977; Fillmore, 1979; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Genessee & Hamayan, 1980; Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975). Only those items pertaining to motivation and personality characteristics were analyzed for the study since other items were included to

minimize the response set. The internal consistency reliability coefficient of the subject's questionnaire was alpha = .71 and that of the teacher's questionnaire was alpha = .63. The scores of the four scales were converted into Z scores and then averaged for the subject's overall score for integrative motivation.

Criterion Variables

1. Listening comprehension. During an individual interview, each subject was asked to listen to a tape and answer either in English or Korean. The tape was made by a monolingual English speaker and question items were composed of basic English required for daily functioning and Korean cultural items (see Appendix C).

2. Oral production test. During an individual interview, each subject was asked to tell a story in English about two pictures. The subject's response was tape recorded and was rated by six college students on a five-point scale. Intra-classificactory reliability (r = .96) among the six ratings was established.

3. Actual language behavior. To investigate how much English interaction there was with peers and teachers, time sampling of actual language behavior of the subjects in ordinary school setting was collected at the mid-point of the study. There were four kinds of actual language behavior; (a) the subject is addressed by peer, (b) the subject talked to peer, (c) the subject is addressed by the teacher, and (d) the subject talked to the teacher.

Procedures

1. Data from subjects. The subject's interview format questionnaire, the Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale, listening comprehension pretest, and oral pretest were individually administered at the beginning of the study. The three tests were administered to all subjects in the following

order: (a) the interview format questionnaire and (b) the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. The interview format questionnaire, which mainly consisted of demographic information, was administered first in an attempt to help the subjects be less apprehensive withthe test situation. All tests were administered by a trained bilingual interviewer during the "pullout" bilingual period. Each subject was asked to come to a resource room which was located close to the bilingual classroom in both schools.

The interviewer began by visiting with the subjects to establish rapport and all test instructions were given in Korean. If it appeared that the instructions were not clear to the subject,the interviewer used other Korean words, sentences, or English words in Korean until the subject understood the questions. The subjects were asked to describe what they had to do in a given test. In responding during the interview, the subjects were encouraged to ask questions concerning any particular item about which they were unsure.

For the oral production and listening comprehension pretest, the subjects were randomly assigned to the order of test taking. Half of the subjects were administered the listening comprehension test first. In this test the subjects listened to an English monolingual female speaker speaking at a normal speed; the subjects were asked to answer in either Korean or English. The tape played only once for all subjects and for all questions. For oral production test, the subjects were shown two pages of a storybook, which was one of the most famous and well-known Korean folk tales, and asked to make a story about the pictures in English. When the subjects indicated that they understood the instructions, they were given as much time as they needed to tell a story, which was recorded.

Identical oral production and listening comprehension posttests were administered to the subjects about four and a half months later. Listening comprehension test was scored individually by counting the total number of correct responses made by each subject (maximum correct responses = 15). Each subject's oral production tests were recorded on an individual tape. A number ranging from one to 63 was randomly assigned to the 63 tapes, which were rated on a five-point scale by three male and three female college sophomores. When ratings were completed, the tapes were regrouped by pre- and posttests with the subjects' coding numbers. Each child's pretest score was obtained by adding all 6 raters' rating points, resulting in a maximum of 30 points per subject. The same procedure was used for the posttest.

At the mid-points of the study, each subject was observed by two female observers in the classroom and during recess. Each observer charted the subject's language behavior at the tone of a beep which was introduced at 10-second intervals during each three-minute time sampling per situation. A recording chart was prepared for each observer. The observer, who looked at the subject when the beep sounded, would place a check mark (✓) in an appropriate column indicating to whom the subject was talking or by whom the subject was addressed. Each subject was observed during four different situations (class observation and recess observation by both observers). Therefore, there were 18 possible check marks per situation; the maximum possible for a subject in all four situations was 72 (see Appendices D & E). Random assignment was used to decide which school should be observed first; then the class and recess observations were made as was convenient for the teachers. Children in the same class were randomly assigned for the observations within a particular class. The two observers did not simultaneously observe the same subject.

Before the actual observation period, an inter-rater reliability was established. The two observers rated two subjects for the same length of time. When the records were compared, both raters had identical check marks for each of the two subjects.

2. Data from the teachers. Prior to the experiment, a letter explaining the experiment and a consent request were sent to teachers who had subjects in their classes. A teacher conference with the investigator was set up by each of the school principals. The teachers were informed that the study was to investigate factors involved in second language learning by Korean immigrant children and the purpose of using the teacher questionnaire and the Devereux Elementary School Behavior Rating Scale was explained. The questionnaires and self-addressed envelopes were distributed.

Those teachers who had peer-paired subjects were asked to remain for further instruction. They were informed of the operational definition of peer-pairing and were asked to make seating arrangements so that peer-paired subjects would be seated near their chosen peers. In addition, the teachers were asked to tell the American peers that the teachers wanted them to "help" their Korean friends "to learn English by explaining to them, answering their questions, or just being friends."

Results

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient analysis revealed that there were statistically significant correlations among oral pretest, oral posttest, listening pretest, and listening posttest, regardless of group membership. There was also significance between "talk to peer" and "addressed from peer to subject," regardless of group membership (see tables 2 & 3). Overall, however, there were more variables that indicated significance in the peer paired group (42 variables) compared to those of the non-peer-paired group (22 variables).

Best Predictors for the Formal Language Learning

Oral production posttest and listening comprehension posttest were used as dependent variables to measure the formal language learning. Stepwise multiple regression analyses revealed that the oral production pretest was the best predictor for both oral production and listening comprehension performance. The listening comprehension pretest and the group membership (peer-paired vs. non-peer-paired) were also significant predictors for listening comprehension (see tables 4 and 5).

Table 2

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient Matrix

By Treatment Groups

Peer-Paired Group (N = 14)

	OPPRE	OPPOST	LISPRE	LISPOST	TPEER	APEER	TTEACH	ATEACH	INTMOT
OPPRE	1.00	.80**	.70**	.68**	.23	.27	.39	.54*	.47*
OPPOST	.80*	1.00	.73**	.83**	.37	.52*	.63**	.57*	.48*
LISPRE	.70**	.73**	1.00	.88**	.35	.40	.71**	.62**	.57*
LISTPOST	.68**	.83**	.88**	1.00	.10	.35	.74**	.51*	.42
TPEER	.23	.37	.35	.10	1.00	.78**	.10	.39	.57*
APEER	.27	.52*	.40	.35	.78**	1.00	.18	.29	.69**
TTEACH	.39	.63**	.71**	.74**	.10	.18	1.00	.56*	.13
ATEACH	.54*	.57*	.62**	.51*	.39	.29	.56*	1.00	.21
INTMOT	.47*	.48*	.57*	.42	.57*	.69**	.13	.21	1.00

Note: OPPRE: Oral Production Pretest, OPPOST: Oral Production Posttest, LISPRE: Listening Comprehension Pretest, LISPOST: Listening Comprehension Posttest, TPEER: Talking to Peer, APEER: Addressed from Peer to Subject, TTEACH: Talking to Teacher, ATEACH: Addressed from Teacher to Subject, INTMOT: Integrative Motivation

* $p < .05$

** $p < .001$

Table 3

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient Matrix

By Treatment Groups

Non-Peer-Paired Group (N = 16)

	OPPRE	OPPOST	LISPRE	LISPOST	TPEER	APEER	TTEACH	ATEACH	INTMOT
OPPRE	1.00	.88**	.56**	.76**	-.06	.01	.26	.31	.65**
OPPOST	.88**	1.00	.63**	.65**	.13	.23	.21	.27	.67**
LISPRE	.56**	.63**	1.00	.75**	-.12	-.08	.18	.20	.35
LISTPOST	.76**	.65**	.75**	1.00	-.12	.04	.36	.37	.63**
TPEER	-.06	.13	-.12	-.12	1.00	.70**	.09	-.01	.33
APEER	.02	.23	-.08	.04	.70**	1.00	.23	.25	.15
TTEACH	.26	.21	.18	.36	.09	.23	1.00	.97**	.38
ATEACH	.31	.27	.20	.37	-.01	.25	97**	1.00	.30
INTMOT	.65**	.67**	.35	.63**	.33	.15	.38	.30	1.00

Note: OPPRE: Oral Production Pretest, OPPOST: Oral Production Posttest, LISPRE: Listening Comprehension Pretest, LISPOST: Listening Comprehension Posttest, TPEER: Talking to Peer, APEER: Addressed from Peer to Subject, TTEACH: Talking to Teacher, ATEACH: Addressed from Teacher to Subject, INTMOT: Integrative Motivation

* $p < .05$

** $p < .001$

Table 4

Multiple Regression Analysis (Stepwise)

Dependent Variable = Oral Production Post

Step	Entered	F	Multiple R	R^2	R^2 Change	Adjusted R^2
1	OPPRE	75.76*	.85	.73	.73	.73
2	LISPRE	2.6	.87	.75	.02	.74
3	GROUP	2.8	.88	.78	.02	.75
4	INTMOT	1.1	.89	.79	.01	.75
5	GROUPINT	.05	.89	.79	.0	.74

Note: OPPRE: Oral Production Pretest

LISPRE: Listening Comprehension Pretest

GROUP: Peer-pair vs. Non-peer-pair

INTMOT: Integrative Motivation

GROUPINT: Interaction Between Group and Integrative Motivation

*$p < .001$

Table 5

Multiple Regression Analysis (Stepwise)

Dependent Variable = Listening Comprehension Post

Step	Entered	F	Multiple R	R^2	R^2 Change	Adjusted R^2
1	OPPRE	29.67**	.72	.52	.52	.48
2	LISPRE	11.15*	.81	.66	.14	.63
3	GROUP	6.5*	.85	.73	.07	.69
4	INTMOT	.49	.86	.731	.005	.69
5	GROUPINT	.03	.86	.731	.001	.68

*$p < .05$

**$p < .001$

Best Predictors for the Actual Language Behavior

To find the best predictors for the actual language behavior, "talking to peer" and "addressed from peer to subject" were used as dependent measures. Stepwise regression analyses indicated peer-pairing and interaction between peer-pairing and integrative motivation were significant variables (see tables 6 and 7).

Table 6

Multiple Regression Analysis (Stepwise)

Dependent Variable = Talking to Peer

Step	Entered	F	Multiple R	R^2	R^2 Change	Adjusted R^2
1	GROUP	15.1**	.59	.35	.35	.33
2	GROUPINT	6.9*	.70	.49	.14	.45
3	INTMOT	1.7	.72	.51	.02	.46
4	OPPRE	.02	.72	.53	.02	.46

*p < .05

**p < .001

Table 7

Multiple Regression Analysis (Stepwise)

Dependent Variable = Addressed From Peer to Student

Step	Entered	F	Multiple R	R^2	R^2 Change	Adjusted R^2
1	GROUP	30.26**	.72	.52	.52	.70
2	GROUPINT	19.14**	.85	.72	.20	.70
3	INTMOT	.13	.85	.72	.00	.69
4	OPPRE	.19	.85	.72	.00	.68

* p < .05

**p < .001

Peer pairing and integrative motivation had significant effects on subject's actual language behavior. Table 8 represents mean, standard deviation, and F value of ten variables by group membership and high and low integrative motivation. Integrative motivation alone did not predict either actual language behavior or formal language performance, however, it played a significant role when it interacted with peer-pairing: A group of subjects who had high integrative motivation but were not peer paired had lower mean scores ($\bar{X}$ = 7.4 for "talk to peer" and $\bar{X}$ = 3.4 for "addressed from peer") than the group of subjects who had high integrative motivation and were peer paired ($\bar{X}$ = 16.8 for "talk to peer" and $\bar{X}$ = 15.5 for "addressed from peer"). It was also noteworthy that the oral production and listening comprehension pretests, which were selected as the best predictors of formal language learning, were not significant predictors for the actual language behavior.

Table 8

Mean, SD, F Value of Formal Language Learning and Actual Behavior Measurement by Group with High and Low Integrative Motivation

	Low INTMOT				High INMOT				F
	Peer-Pair		Non-Peer-Pair		Peer-Pair		Non-Peer-Pair		
	Mean	S D	Mean	S D	Mean	S D	Mean	S D	
LISPRE	2.1	3.9	4.4	7.2	7.6	4.0	8.7	4.0	6.2*
LISTPOST	7.3	2.9	5.9	1.9	10.6	2.9	9.4	1.8	16.7**
TPEER	11.2	4.3	3.3	2.9	16.8	8.9	7.4	6.9	4.8*
APEER	7.7	4.0	2.4	1.8	15.5	5.6	3.4	2.9	5.8*
TTEACH	.5	.8	.2	.4	1.6	1.7	1.6	2.9	4.5*
ATEACH	0	0	0	0	.9	1.1	1	2.6	3.6
OPPRE	13.3	6.7	9.6	4.6	18.3	5	18	8.4	10 *
OPPOST	17.5	5.6	14.2	5.7	24	5.9	21.3	6.8	10.9*
LISDIF	5.2	2.7	1.4	5.9	3	1.9	.71	2.7	.47
OPPDIF	4.2	5.4	4.7	4.3	5.8	2.8	3.3	2.7	0

Note: LISDIF: Difference Between Listening Pre- and Posttest

OPPDIF: Difference Between Oral Pre- and Posttest

* $p < .05$

** $p < .001$

Discussion and Conclusions

Hypothesis 1 was partially confirmed by the study. The effects of peer-pairing were significant for actual language behavior and listening comprehension. However, the peer-pairing was not a significant factor in oral production. The fact that the effects of peer-pairing were important factors in actual language behavior was indicated by Fillmore's (1976) longitudinal study. The current study adds evidence to the hypothesis that peer-pairing would increase actual language behavior in the normal classroom situation.

Hypothese 2 was also partially confirmed. Integrative motivation was a significant variable in the actual language behavior, but was not a significant predictor for formal language learning.

The motivational variable (integrative motivation), which was extensively reviewed in the literature, did not seem to be a crucial factor in formal language learning--at least it was not with Korean immigrant children in this particular area. The results of the study cause one to question whether a global generalization about effects of motivation on second-language learning can be made. The results of the current study seem to indicate that there may be distinctively different factors involved in actual language behavior and formal language performance of second-language learning. For example, motivatin did not appear to be a major factor in determining how well children performed on the formal language tests, although its effect was statistically significant in predicting actual language behavior when it was paired with treatment condition (peer-pairing). Likewise, prior linguistic knowledge, which was a powerful predictor for formal language learning, failed to be significant in predicting actual language behavior.

Hypothesis 3 was confirmed by the study. The subjects who were peer-paired and scored high on integrative motivation had higher scores on both

formal language tests and actual language behavior than the subjects who either were peer-paired and had lower scores on integrative motivation, or were not peer-paired and had higher scores on integrative motivation.

Integrative motivation alone was not as strong a predictor as peer-pairing in Korean children's second-language learning. Even for the actual language behavior ("talking to peer"), only 2% of the variance was accounted for and failed to show statistical significance, while 35% was explained by peer-pairing (see table 6). Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that peer-pairing was instrumental to demonstrated interaction between peer-pairing and integrative motivation. This finding is in support of Fillmore's (1976) contention that proper input through social interaction leads a learner to develop appropriate learning strategies to facilitate second-language learning.

The brief study period (4 1/2 months), formal language tests of Korean cultural orientation, and the restricted population are some threats to external validity which, in turn, limit the extent of generalization.

An ad-hoc stepwise multiple regression analysis was used in an attempt to examine which variable was the most significant predictor of how well children talked (see table 9). The "addressed from peer to subject" was a great deal more important than the "talking to peer" in predicting the oral language performance. As indicated in table 9, the "addressed from peer to subject" entered a second-best after the oral production pretest on a stepwise regression. The "talking to peer" entered as the sixth predictor; thus, an insignificant per cent of variation was explained by this variable.

Table 9

Multiple Regression Analysis (Stepwise)

Dependent Variable = Oral Production Post

Step	Entered	F	Multiple R	R^2	R^2 Change	Adjusted R^2
1	OPPRE	75.8**	.86	.73	.73	.72
2	APEER	8.1*	.89	.79	.06	.78
3	LISPRE	4.8*	.91	.83	.04	.81
4	TTEACH	.31	.91	.83	.00	.80
5	ATEACH	1.4	.92	.84	.01	.80
6	TPEER	.02	.92	.84	.00	.80

* $p < .05$

** $p < .001$

According to the present study, merely practicing talking with the target language group does not necessarily increase a second-language learner's oral performance. Rather, the opportunity to be addressed by the target language speakers is a crucial factor. The classroom teacher's encouragement to the American pupil provided the opportunity to be addressed by the target language speakers.

The practical implications of this study in the classroom are simple and easy to apply. The peer-pairing is cost effective; finding a peer of the second language learner's choice, making seating arrangements and encouraging the American peer to be altruistic to the second-language learner are the only necessary conditions for the peer-pairing. The peer-pairing will provide a personal importance and acceptance to the second-language learners. It will also provide a personal importance and positive feelings to the American peers;

they will feel important because their teacher asked them to help another classmate and it will facilitate positive feelings because of their altruistic behavior. The peer pairing is a positive practice for all involved: The American pupils will be feeling important due to their contribution, the second-language learners' learning will be facilitated by American peers' personal attention, and the teacher will profit because the second language learners will comprehend and speak English.

References

Alderson, J. C. The cloze procedure and proficiency in English as a foreign language. TESOL Quarterly, 1979, 13(2), 219-227.

Ainsfeld, M., & Lambert, W. E. Social and psychological variables in learning Hebrew. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 524-529.

Brown, H. D. Affective variable in second language acquisition. Language Learning, 1973, 23(2), 231-244.

Carroll, J. B. Characteristics of successful second language learners. In M. Burt, H. Dulay, & M. Finocchiaro (Eds.), Viewpoints on English as a second language. New York: Regents, 1977.

Chastain, K. D. Affective and ability factors in second-language acquisition. Language Learning, 1975, 25(1), 153-161.

Chastain, K. D. Testing listening comprehension tests. TESOL Quarterly, 1979, 13(1), 81-88.

Christiansen, T., & Livermore, G. A comparison of Anglo-American and Spanish-American children on the WISC. Journal of Social Psychology, 1970, 81, 9-14.

Crowne, D. P. & Marlowe, D. The approval of motive. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Dieterich, T. G., Freeman, C., & Crandall, J. A. A linguistic analysis of some English proficiency tests. TESOL Quarterly, 1979, 13(4), 535-550.

Ervin-Tripp, S. An analysis of the interaction of language, topic and listener. In J. J. Gumperz & D. H. Hymes (Eds.), The ethonography of communication. American Anthropologist Special Publication 3, 1964.

Fillmore, L. W. The second time around: Cognitive and social strategies in second language acquisition. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1976.

Fishman, J. A. Bilingualism with and without diglossia: Diglossia with and without bilingualism. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, 29-38.

Fishman, J. A. Sociolinguistic perspective on the study of bilingualism. Linguistics, 1968, 39, 20-48.

Fishman, J. A., Cooper, R. L., & Ma, R. (Eds.). Bilingualism in the Barrio. Final Report. Yeshiva University. Washington D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1968.

Gardner, R. C. Motivational variables in second language acquisition. In R. C. Gardner, & W. E. Lambert (Eds.), Attitudes and motivation. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1972, pp. 199-216.

Gardner, R. C. On the validity of affective variables in second language acquisition: Conceptual, contextual, and statistical considerations. Language Learning, 1980, 30(2), 255-270.

Gardner, R. C., Ginsberg, R. E., & Smythe, P. C. Attitude and motivation in second language learning. Canadian Modern Language Review, 1976, 32, 243-266.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. Motivational variables in second language acquisition. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 1959, 13, 266-272.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. Language aptitude, intelligence and second language achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1965, 56, 191-199.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. Attitude and motivation in second language learning. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1972.

Gardner, R. C., & Smythe, P. C. Motivation and second language acquisition. Canadian Modern Language Review, 1975, 31, 218-230.

Gardner, R. C., Smythe, P. C., Clement, R., & Gliksman, L. Second language learning: A social psychology perspective. Canadian Modern Language Review, 1976, 32, 198-213.

Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. Individual differences in second language learning. Applied Psycholinguistics, 1980, 1, 95-110.

Gumperz, J. J. On the linguistic markers of bilingual communication. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, 48-57.

Hamayan, E., Genesee, F., & Tucker, R. Affective factors and language exposure in second language learning. Language Learning, 1977, 27(2), 225-240.

Hickey, T. Bilingualism and the measurement of intelligence and verbal learning ability. Exceptional Children, 1972, 39(1), 24-28.

Holmes, J. Sociolinguistic competence in the classroom. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), Understanding second and foreign language learning. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1978.

Hymes, D. Models of the interaction of language and social setting. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, 8-28.

Kittell, J. A. Intelligence test performance of children from bilingual environments. Elementary School Journal, 1963, 64, 76-83.

Lado, R. Language testing: The construction and use of foreign language tests. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Lambert, W. E. Psychological approach to the study of language, Part 1: On second language learning and bilingualism. The Modern Language Journal, 1963, 47(3), 51-62.

Lambert, W. E. A social psychology of bilingualism. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, 91-109.

Lambert, W. E., Gardner, R. C., Barik, H. C., & Tunstall, K. Attitudinal and cognitive aspects of intensive study of second language. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66(4), 358-368.

Lambert, W. E., Tucker, G. R. & d'Anglejan, A. Cognitive and attitudinal consequences of bilingual schooling: The St. Lambert project through grade five. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 65(2), 141-159.

Oller, J., Baca, L., & Virgil, F. Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: A sociolinguistic study of Mexican Americans in the Southwest. TESOL Quarterly, 1977, 11, 173-182.

Oller, ..., Hudson, & Liu. Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: A sociolinguistic study of speakers of Chinese in the United States. Language Learning, 1977, 27, 1-27.

Pierson, H. D., Fu, G. S., & Lee, S. Y. An analysis of the relationship between language attitudes and English attainment of secondary students in Hong Kong. Language Learning, 1980, 30(2), 289-316.

Raven, J. The Coloured Progressive Matrices, Sets A, Ab, B. London, WCIE 6BS: Lewis & Co., 1962.

Robinett, B. W. Teaching English to speakers of other languages: Substance and technique. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.

Roca, P. Problems of adapting intelligence scales from one culture to another. High School Journal, 1955, 18, 124-131.

Rubin, J. What the 'good language learner' can teach us. TESOL Quarterly, 1975, 9, 41-51.

Schumann, J. H. Affective factors and the problem of age in second language acquisition. Language Learning, 1975, 25, 209-235.

Schumann, J. H. Social distance as a factor in second language acquisition. Language Learning, 1976, 26(1), 135-143.

Schumann, J. H. Social and psychological factors in second language acquisition. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), Understanding second and foreign language learning. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1978.

Scovel, T. The effect of affect on foreign language learning: A review of the anxiety research. Language Learning, 1978, 28, 129-142.

Seliger, H. W. Does practice make perfect?: A study of interaction patterns and L2 competence. Language Learning, 1977, 27(2), 263-276.

Spivack, G., & Swift, M. Devereaux Elementary School Behavior Rating Scale. Devon, PA: The Devereux Foundation, 1967.

Spolsky, B. Attitudinal aspects of second language learning. Language Learning, 1969, 19(3 & 4), 271-283.

Stern, H. H. What can we learn from the good language learner? Canadian Modern Language Review, 1975, 31, 304-318.

Swain, M., & Burnaby, B. Personality characteristics and second language learning in young children: A pilot study. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 1976, 11, 115-128.

Tucker, G. R., Hamayan, E., & Genesee, F. Affective, cognitive, and social factors in second language acquisition. Canadian Modern Language Review, 1976, 32, 214-226.

Zampogna, J., Gentile, R. J., Papalia, A., & Gordon, R. S. Relationship between learning styles and learning environments in selected secondary modern language classes. Modern Language Journal, 1976, 60, 443-448.

Appendix A

Questionnaire for Subject

Code _____

Sex: ____M ____F
Age: 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

No. younger sibs: 1 2 3 4 5 6
Age of younger sibs: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
No. of older sibs: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Age of older sibs: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

Place of birth: 1. Korea 2. America 3. Other _____
Please specify

A. PEERS

1. Your friends are very important to you. yes ( ) no ( )
2. You enjoy talking to your friends more than to adults. yes ( ) no ( )
3. You most like to play with your:
   a. English speaking friends.
   b. Korean speaking friends. a ( ) b ( )
4. You like to play most with:
   a. Dramatic play (house, school, doctor/nurse, etc.) with English speaking friends. a ( ) b ( ) c ( )
   b. Dramatic play with Korean speaking friends.
   c. Alone with toys, games or books.

B. ADULTS

1. You enjoy talking to adults more than to your friends. yes ( ) no ( )
2. You like your teacher very much. yes ( ) no ( )

C. LANGUAGE

1. You like to practice new English words that you hear. yes ( ) no ( )
2. You do not like to speak English because you are afraid you will make a mistake. yes ( ) no ( )
3. When your teacher asks you a question in English you are happy to answer in English. yes ( ) no ( )

4. You learn English most from:
   a. Parents; a ( ) b ( )
   b. T.V.; c ( ) d ( )
   c. Friends; e ( )
   d. Teachers;
   e. Books.

5. Your parents encourage you to study English. yes ( ) no ( )

6. You have had the opportunity to hear English spoken with friends of the family. yes ( ) no ( )

7. The language you speak most at home with your sisters/brothers is:
   a. Korean a ( ) b ( )
   b. English c ( )
   c. Other.

8. Two people you play with the most after school are:

   _____ _____

9. You speak: a. Korean b. English a ( ) b ( )
   with them.

D. COUNTRY

1. Do you wish you were still in Korea? yes ( ) no ( )

2. Are you glad that you are in America? yes ( ) no ( )

Appendix B

Questionnaire for Teacher

Please answer as directed by the instructions. DO NOT PUT DOWN YOUR NAME, as personal data will be kept confidential. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Code _____

Your Sex: _____M _____F

Please put a check in the "yes" or "no," or the letter that indicates the appropriate answer.

1. The student is very outgoing. yes ( ) no ( )
2. The student is shy. yes ( ) no ( )
3. The student enjoys talking to English-speaking peers more than to English-speaking adults. yes ( ) no ( )
4. The student engages in solitary play during free time. yes ( ) no ( )
5. The student enjoys talking to English monolingual adults (i.e., teachers) more than to English monolingual peers. yes ( ) no ( )
6. The student enjoys practicing new English words without hesitation. yes ( ) no ( )
7. The student hesitates to speak English. yes ( ) no ( )
8. The student is quick to give answers to questions. yes ( ) no ( )
9. The student spends time before he or she responds. yes ( ) no ( )
10. The student has a positive attitude about adjusting to new culture and language. yes ( ) no ( )
11. The student's parents are very cooperative with the school. yes ( ) no ( )
12. The student plays most with:
    a. Monolingual English-speaking peers.
    b. Limited-English-speaking peers.
    c. Bilingual peers.

    a ( ) b ( ) c ( )

13. The student uses free time with games that require verbalization. yes ( ) no ( )

If yes,

a. The student plays with monolingual English-speaking peers. a ( ) b ( )
b. The student plays with limited-English-speaking Koreans c ( )
c. The student plays with bilingual peers.

COMMENTS:

Appendix C

Listening Comprehension Test

Code _____

Listen carefully to the tape and answer questions either in English or Korean.

1. This is Korea's main vegetable dish. It is usually made of cabbage, garlic, green onion, and red pepper. It is hot and spicy. Can you tell me what it is?

   _____

2. This is a Korean holiday. Koreans usually dress up in Korean clothes and bow to parents and relatives. The parents and relatives give children money for bowing. Can you tell me the name of this holiday?

   _____

3. A traditional Korean meal always includes this dish. It is served with almost every meal. What is this food called?

   _____

4. Instead of a fork, Koreans and other orientals use two long, thin sticks to eat with. What are these sticks called?

   _____

5. We are now in a room that is used less often than most of the other rooms in the house. But it has a very important function in the social life of the family. Guests are received here, and there are chairs, a sofa, pictures, lamps, tables, and reading material for their comfort and enjoymnet. Where are we?

   _____

6. This machine removes dust and dirt from floors, carpet, furniture, and window sills. Its motor blows air and creates a strong suction. It makes a loud noise when it is on. There are two types: an upright and a cannister model. What is it?

   _____

7. Listen carefully and tell me the story in Korean.

   Mrs. Park: What type of house are you looking for?

   Mr. Jones: I would like a small place with three bedrooms and a bath.

   Mrs. Jones: I would like a big old house with a fireplace in the living room.

   Mrs. Park: Is there anything that you would both like?

   The Jones: Yes, someone who likes what I like!

8. Do you like to learn English? yes ( ) no ( )

9. What do you do to help your mother or father at home?_____

_____

10. What do you like to do when you are alone? _____

_____

11. How do you get to school? _____

Appendix D

Sample of Observation Charts

Peer Pair

School | Grade | Room Number
Teacher's Name | Observer's Number: 1 | Situation: Class

Subject's Code Number	Talking to: Paired Peer	Another Peer	Teacher	Addressed to from Paired Peer	Another Peer	Teacher
01P						
02P						
03P						

Non-Peer Pair

School | Grade | Room Number
Teacher's Name | Observer's Number: 1 | Situation: Class

Subject's Code Number	Talking to: Peer	Teacher	Addressed to from Peer	Teacher
01P				
02P				
03P				

Note: Maximum number of check marks for each subject is 18

Appendix E.1

Actual Language Behavior by Treatment Groups

Peer Pair (N = 14)

	Talking to												Addressed to from											
	Paired Peer				Another Peer				Teacher				Paired Peer				Another Peer				Teacher			
	Class		Recess		Class		Recess		Class		Recess		Class		Recess		Class		Recess		Class		Recess	
Name	01	02	01	02	01	02	01	02	01	02	01	02	01	02	01	02	01	02	01	02	01	02	01	02
01P	1	0	2	0	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0
02P	3	4	5	6	5	4	5	2	0	1	0	0	3	3	3	4	1	1	3	3	0	2	0	0
03P	0	1	3	2	1	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
04P	2	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
05P	4	4	0	2	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	3	2	2	3	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0
06P	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
07P	5	0	3	4	0	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	6	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
08P	1	1	0	1	2	2	4	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	0
09P	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0
10P	0	0	6	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	3	1	0	1	0	0	0
11P	2	0	2	1	0	1	4	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	1	5	3	0	3	0	0
12P	0	0	2	3	0	1	3	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0
13P	2	1	5	3	5	3	3	2	1	0	0	0	3	3	3	2	1	4	4	4	0	0	0	0
14P	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0
	20	11	31	31	19	22	36	31	9	7	0	0	19	15	26	25	11	13	28	33	2	5	0	0
	201								16				170								7			

Appendix E.2

Actual Language Behavior by Treatment Groups

Non-Peer Pair (N = 16)

	Talking to								Addressed to from							
	Peer				Teacher				Peer				Teacher			
	Class		Recess		Class		Recess		Class		Recess		Class		Recess	
Name	01	02	01	02	01	02	01	02	01	02	01	02	01	02	01	02
01NP	6	9	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	0
02NP	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
03NP	2	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
04NP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
05NP	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
06NP	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0
07NP	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
08NP	0	0	4	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
09NP	0	0	1	4	3	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	5	0	0
10NP	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
11NP	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0
12NP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
13NP	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0
14NP	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
15NP	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
16NP	2	3	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
	15	15	20	32	6	7	0	0	3	7	11	25	2	5	0	0
	82				13				21				7			

Note: Actual language behavior of each subject = talking to peer and talking to teacher and addressed from peer and addressed to subject from teacher. Maximum score of actual language behavior for each subject = 72. 01 = Observer 1; 02 = Observer 2.